## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/CN03/00925

In response to the invitation (Form PCt/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:    paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee   paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid   not paid additional fees  2. ☑ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees:  3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is   complied with or the following reasons:   Claims 1 and 12, 13 and 21, 20 and 22, 23 and 26 are respectively the methods and the equipments thereof. The specific technical features of the former three groups are adapting the size of the PDU, separating and combining the compressed header, the several features are all used for that the two RLC models can support the PDU thayeriting mode on the PDC layer which request higher the real time characteristic adopted the ROHC header compressing mode, so they are technically interelated and belongs to a single general invention concept, so the former three groups claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention. But the specific technical features of the forth claims 23 and 26 are the method of the scheduling the packet of the RCPC and the equipment thereof; so there are not sensor or the corresponding special sechnical features between the former three groups of the claims and the forth group of the claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention.  4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:    description   d	Box 1	No. I	V La	ck of unity of invention
paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid not paid additional fees  This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees:  This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is complied with not complied with for the following reasons: Claims 1 and 12, 13 and 21, 20 and 22, 23 and 26 are respectively the methods and the equipments thereof. The specific technical features of the former three groups are adapting the size of the PDU, separating and combining the compressed header, the several features are all used for that the two RLC models can support the PDU transmitting mode on the PDCP layer which request higher the real time characteristic adopted the ROHC header compressing mode, so they are technically interrelated and belongs to a single general invention concept, so the former three groups claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention. But the specific technical features of the forth thans 23 and 26 are the method of the scheduling the packet of the RTCP and the equipment thereof, so there are no the same or the corresponding special technical features between the former three groups of the claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention.  Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:  all parts.	1.		In resp	conse to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid    not paid additional fees  2.				paid additional fees
□ not paid additional fees  2. ☑ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees:  3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is  □ complied with ○ not complied with for the following reasons: Claims 1 and 12, 13 and 21, 20 and 22, 23 and 26 are respectively the methods and the equipments thereof. The specific technical features of the former three groups are adapting the size of the PDU, separating and combining the compressed header, the several features are all used for that the two RLC models can support the PDU transmitting mode on the PDCP layer which request higher the real time characteristic adopted the ROMC header compressing mode, so they are technically interrelated and belongs to a single general invention concept, so the former three groups claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention. But the specific technical features of the forth claims 23 and 26 are the method of the scheddling the packet of the RTCP and the equipment thereof, so there are no the same or the corresponding special technical features between the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention.  4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:  □ all parts.				paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee
2.   This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees:  This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is  complied with  ont complied with for the following reasons:  Claims 1 and 12, 13 and 21, 20 and 22, 23 and 26 are respectively the methods and the equipments thereof. The specific technical features of the former three groups are adapting the size of the PDU, separating and combining the compressed header, the several features are all used for that the two RLC models can support the PDU transmitting mode on the PDCP layer which request higher the real time characteristic adopted the ROHC header compressing mode, so they are technically interrelated and belongs to a single general invention concept, so the former three groups claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention. But the specific technical features of the forth claims 23 and 26 are the method of the scheduling the packet of the RTCP and the equipment thereof, so there are no the same or the corresponding special technical features between the former three groups of the claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims.				paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid
to pay additional fees:  3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is  complied with  not complied with for the following reasons:  Claims 1 and 12, 13 and 21, 20 and 22, 23 and 26 are respectively the methods and the equipments thereof. The specific technical features of the former three groups are adapting the size of the PDU, separating and combining the compressed header, the several features are all used for that the two RLC models can support the PDU transmitting mode on the PDCP layer which request higher the real time characteristic adopted the ROHC header compressing mode, so they are technically interrelated and belongs to a single general invention concept, so the former three groups claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention. But the specific technical features of the forth claims 23 and 26 are the method of the esheduling the packet of the RTCP and the equipment thereof, so there are no the same or the corresponding special technical features between the former three groups of the claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention.  4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:  □ all parts.				not paid additional fees
complied with  Interception of the following reasons:  Claims 1 and 12, 13 and 21, 20 and 22, 23 and 26 are respectively the methods and the equipments thereof. The specific technical features of the former three groups are adapting the size of the PDU, separating and combining the compressed header, the several features are all used for that the two RLC models can support the PDU transmitting mode on the PDCP layer which request higher the real time characteristic adopted the ROHC header compressing mode, so they are technically interrelated and belongs to a single general invention concept, so the former three groups claims promply with the requirement of the unity of invention. But the specific technical features of the forth claims 23 and 26 are the method of the scheduling the packet of the RTCP and the equipment thereof, so there are no the same or the corresponding special technical features between the former three groups of the claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention.  4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:  □ all parts.		_		
Claims 1 and 12, 13 and 21, 20 and 22, 23 and 26 are respectively the methods and the equipments thereof. The specific technical features of the former three groups are adapting the size of the PDU, separating and combining the compressed header, the several features are all used for that the two RLC models can support the PDU transmitting mode on the PDCP layer which request higher the real time characteristic adopted the ROHC header compressing mode, so they are technically interrelated and belongs to a single general invention concept, so the former three groups claims comply with the requirement of the mity of invention. But the specific technical features of the forth claims 23 and 26 are the method of the scheduling the packet of the RTCP and the equipment thereof, so there are no the same or the corresponding special technical features between the former three groups of the claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims comply with the requirement of the unity of invention.  4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:    A	3.	Thi	s Author	rity considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
☑ all parts.		In the complied with for the following reasons:  Claims 1 and 12, 13 and 21, 20 and 22, 23 and 26 are respectively the methods and the equipments thereof. The specifical features of the former three groups are adapting the size of the PDU, separating and combining the compression header, the several features are all used for that the two RLC models can support the PDU transmitting mode on the PDCP which request higher the real time characteristic adopted the ROHC header compressing mode, so they are techn interrelated and belongs to a single general invention concept, so the former three groups claims comply with the requirem the unity of invention. But the specific technical features of the forth claims 23 and 26 are the method of the scheduling packet of the RTCP and the equipment thereof, so there are no the same or the corresponding special technical features between three groups of the claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims, so the former three groups claims and the forth group of the claims.		
☑ all parts.				
the parts relating to claims Nos.		×	ali parts	
			the parts	s relating to claims Nos.